

PTO/SB/21 (05-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031


U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE


Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/994,257	
	Confirmation Number	8623	
	Filing Date	11/26/2001	
	First Named Inventor	Martin Andrew Schlosser	
	Art Unit	3726	
	Examiner Name	Jermie E. Cozart	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	5	Attorney Docket Number	35015/002

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 24 2006

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Remarks It is believed that no fees are due in this matter. However, if it is determined that fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to debit Deposit Account No. 502622 for the required fees.		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT			
Firm	Setter Ollila LLC		
Signature			
Printed Name	Steven L. Webb		
Date	1/24/2006	Reg. No.	44,395

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO, fax number (571) 273-8300, addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.			
Signature			
Typed or printed name	Jamie Cameron	Date	1/24/2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Setter Ollila LLC
2060 Broadway
Suite 300
Boulder, Colorado 80302

PATENT APPLICATION**ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 35015/002**

**IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 24 2006**

Inventor(s): Martin A. Schlosser**Serial No.: 09/994,257****Examiner: Jermie E. Cozart****Filing Date: 11/26/2001****Group Art Unit: 3726**

**Title: METHOD OF MANUFACTURING A FLOWMETER FOR THE
PRECISION MEASUREMENT OF AN ULTRA PURE MATERIAL FLOW**

**MAILSTOP: Appeal Brief-Patents
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

REPLY BRIEF

This reply brief is being filed in response to the examiners answer mailed on 11/25/2005.

Summary of the requirements for *prima facie* obviousness.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claims 1, 16, 32, 33, 50 and 51 rejection.

Claims 1, 16, 32, 33, 50 and 51 have been finally rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sipin (US 4,559,833) in view of Van der Pol (US 5,918,285). Claim 1 requires:

1. A method of manufacturing a Coriolis flowmeter adapted to extend a received process material flow having an ultra high level of purity free from contamination due to ion transfer from said Coriolis flow meter to said process material; said method comprising the steps of:
 - coupling a flow tube means to a base, wherein said flow tube means is formed entirely from PTFE or PFA;
 - affixing a driver to said flow tube means;
 - coupling a pick-off means to said flow tube means; and
 - affixing inlet and outlet ends of said flow tube means to at least one process connection.

Examiners response to arguments

One of the requirements for a § 103(a) rejection is that there must be a reasonable expectation of success when combining references. In the examiner's response to arguments section from the examiner's answer, the examiner restates that Sipin teaches a flow tube that vibrates along its length. The examiner then states that Van der Pol teaches a flow tube made entirely from PTFE or PFA. The examiner does not address the fact that the flow tube in Sipin is not compatible with the flow tube from Van der Pol. As stated in the appeal brief, the flow tube in Van der Pol does not vibrate along its length, but only vibrates in the thin cutout areas in respond to the Coriolis effect (column 4 lines 17 – 28). Most of the tube in Van der Pol (the thick walled part) does not vibrate. Claim 1 requires a flow tube means. The structure disclosed in the specification is a flow tube (102) that vibrates along its length, not in small thin walled segments. Because only the thin walled segments of Van der Pol vibrate, Van der Pol can not teach a flow tube that vibrates along

its length made entirely from PFA or PTFE. Therefore the combination of Van der Pol. and Sipin do not form an operable structure that makes obvious the invention of claim 1.

The combination of Sipin and Van der Pol. do not produce a flow meter with a reasonable expectation of success because the flow tube types are not compatible. A material that produces a functional flow tube using very small thin walled segments contained in recesses cut into the thick walls of the flow tube can not be expected to work when substituted into a flow tube that vibrates along its entire length without some modification to the design. Sipin does not contemplate any changes in the design of the flow tube to make use of PFA or PTFE. Therefore the modification of Sipin by Van der Pol. does not produce a reasonable expectation of success.

As stated in the appeal brief, the examiner has not provided any motivation to combine Sipin and Van der Pol.

Page 700-31 of column 1 of MPEP §706.02(j) states that:

...the burden is on the Examiner to provide the suggestion of desirability of doing what the Examiner has done. It further states that the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the Examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in the light of the teaching of the references.

The Examiner's rejection does not meet these requirements. The examiner has not cited where the references "expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention". And the examiner has not presented a convincing line of reasoning how someone skilled in the arts would have been motivated to combine the vibrating thin walled segments of Van der Pol with the flow tube of Sipin vibrating along its entire length. In the examiner's answer, the examiner restates what he believes each of the two references teaches, but he does not point to where there is a suggestion for combining the teaching from the two references. Nor does he present a convincing line of reasoning as to why someone skilled in the arts would have found the claimed invention to be obvious in light of the teaching of the two references. Therefore the examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For the reasons cited above it is believed that the claims are allowable as written.


Conclusion

In view of the above, applicant respectfully request that the examiner's rejection of claims 1, 16, 32, 33, 50 and 51 be reversed.

It is believed that no fees are due in this matter. However, if it is determined that fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to debit Deposit Account No. 502622 for the required fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/24/2006

**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Steven L. Webb, Reg. No. 44,395

Setter Ollila LLC

Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 22

Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

CUSTOMER NO. 32827